

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated September 4, 2007.

Claim 19 is amended. Claims 1-19, 21-25 and 27-29 remain pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims Using Banquy, Davis, and Martin

Claims 19, 22-24 and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banquy (U.S. 4,782,096, herein “Banquy”) in view of Davis et al. (“Cryogenics for Syngas Processing”, *Chemical Engineering Progress*, February 1980, pages 72-79, herein “Davis”) and Martin (U.S. 4,102,659, herein “Martin”).

Claim 19

Claim 19 has been amended to better describe the recited subject matter.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that Banquy, Davis, and Martin, individually or in combination, do not provide the claimed subject matter. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Banquy, Davis, and Martin, individually or in combination, among other things, a nitrogen rejection column configured to separate nitrogen from said second cryogenic liquid to produce a third cryogenic liquid, as recited in claim 19.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 19.

Claims 22-24 and 27-29

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 22-24 and 27-29 are dependent on claim 19, which is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Therefore, the discussion above for claim 19 is incorporated herein to support the patentability of claims 22-24 and 27-29.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 22-24 and 27-29.

§103 Rejection of the Claims Using Banquy, Davis, Martin, and Ireland

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banquy in view of Davis and Martin, as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Ireland et al. (U.S. 4,044,063, herein “Ireland”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 21 is dependent on claim 19, which is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. It is believed that the addition of Ireland does not remedy the deficiency of Banquy, Davis, and Ireland as discussed above. Therefore, the discussion above for claim 19 is incorporated herein to support the patentability of claim 21.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 21.

§103 Rejection of the Claims Using Banquy, Davis, Martin, and Keller

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banquy in view of Davis et al. and Martin, as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Keller (U.S. 4,650,814, herein “Keller”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 25 is dependent on claim 19, which is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. It is believed that the addition of Keller does not remedy the deficiency of Banquy, Davis, and Ireland as discussed above. Therefore, the discussion above for claim 19 is incorporated herein to support the patentability of claim 25.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 25.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 373-6912 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6912

Date: 2/4/2008

By /Timothy E. Bianchi/
Timothy E. Bianchi
Reg. No. 39,610

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 4th day of February 2008.

KIMBERLY BROWN

Name

Signature

